```
1
                 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
 2
                          Norfolk Division
 3
 4
       UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 5
               Plaintiff,
 6
                                              CRIMINAL CASE NO.
                                                 2:17cr00001
       V.
 7
       LIONEL NELSON WILLIAMS,
 8
           Defendant.
 9
10
11
                      TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                 TRANSCRIBED FROM COURT-PROVIDED AUDIO
12
              (Initial Appearance and Detention Hearing)
13
14
                           Norfolk, Virginia
15
                            January 4, 2017
16
17
     BEFORE: THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE R. LEONARD,
18
               United States Magistrate Judge
19
20
    APPEARANCES:
2.1
               UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
               By: Joseph E. DePadilla
22
                    Assistant United States Attorney
                    Counsel for the United States
23
               FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE
24
               By: Keith L. Kimball
                    Assistant Federal Public Defender
25
                    Counsel for the Defendant
```

Heidi L. Jeffreys, Official Court Reporter

```
(The hearing commenced at 2:38 p.m.)
 1
 2
              THE CLERK: United States of America v. Lionel
 3
     Nelson Williams, Case 2:17cr1.
 4
              Are counsel ready to proceed?
 5
              MR. DEPADILLA: The United States is ready.
 6
              Good afternoon, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. DePadilla.
              MR. KIMBALL: Judge, good afternoon. The defense is
 8
 9
     ready.
10
              THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Kimball.
11
              There's a couple of housekeeping matters I want to
12
     attend to first. We're here initially for a preliminary
1.3
     hearing and a detention hearing in this matter.
14
     defendant had his initial appearance a couple of weeks ago,
15
     and the preliminary and detention hearing, specifically the
16
     detention hearing, was continued until today.
              Mr. Kimball, I assume -- because the request to
17
18
     continue the hearing was not made in open court, I assume
19
     that's defendant's motion in order to give defendant
20
     sufficient time to prepare for these hearings. Is that
2.1
     correct?
2.2
              MR. KIMBALL: That is correct, Judge.
23
              THE COURT: All right. Well, ordinarily, those
24
     requests outside of the five-day period should be made before
25
     the Court so that the Court can determine that there is just
```

```
cause to continue the hearing, but I'll go ahead and make
 1
 2
     that finding.
 3
              The second matter is that, as I said, it was
 4
     scheduled for a preliminary hearing and a detention hearing,
 5
     but I believe the Grand Jury has returned an indictment this
 6
     morning and that the indictment obviates the need for the
 7
     preliminary hearing.
 8
              Mr. Kimball, have you been provided a copy of the
 9
     indictment?
10
              MR. KIMBALL: I have.
11
              THE COURT: All right. Then before we proceed to
     the detention hearing aspect of today's proceedings, I do
12
1.3
     believe it's necessary to go through an initial appearance on
14
     the indictment.
15
              So let me ask you, Mr. Williams, are you Lionel
16
     Nelson Williams?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I am.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Williams, this part of
19
     the proceeding is called an initial appearance, and the
20
     purpose of this proceeding is for the Court to advise you of
```

charges that have been brought against you and of certain rights you have in connection with those charges.

You've been charged by an indictment from the Norfolk Grand Jury with one count of attempt to provide

2.1

22

23

24

25

Heidi L. Jeffreys, Official Court Reporter

material support or resources to a designated foreign

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

argument. All right?

terrorist organization. In connection with those charges, you have the right to an attorney and to have the Court appoint an attorney for you. If you cannot afford one, you have previously been appointed representation by the Federal Public Defender, and so that representation will continue. In addition, you are advised you are not required to make any statement, but you need to know that any statement you do make can be used against you. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kimball has already advised that he has received a copy of the indictment, so with the initial appearance then being held, Mr. Kimball, do you wish to proceed and go forward on the detention hearing? MR. KIMBALL: We do, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Now, correct me if I'm wrong, please, but it's the Court's understanding that this is a presumption case, given the charge under 2339B. MR. KIMBALL: Judge, we would agree. THE COURT: All right. Then the way I like to handle presumption cases, I'll hear from the defendant first, any factual proffer you wish to make, including whether you wish to call any witnesses to rebut the presumption of detention, and then once you're done, then I'll hear from the government their factual proffer, and then we'll have

MR. KIMBALL: That's fine, Judge.

Your Honor, the Court has been provided and, I'm sure, has read the Pretrial Services report, and certainly we would rely on the information, the factual information, about

Mr. Williams in that report to rebut the presumption.

But, in addition to that, Your Honor, I would proffer to the

Court that in the Pretrial Services report it notes my

client's grandmother as a suitable third-party custodian. My

client's grandmother is here, Your Honor, Ms. Courtney Jones.

She's right here. She's raising her hand.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KIMBALL: I would proffer to the Court, Your Honor, that I know that Mr. Armitage has spoken with her about the obligations of being a third-party custodian. I, myself, and other members of my team have also discussed that with her. She's willing to serve as a third-party custodian. She's also willing to sign off on any bond that may be set.

In addition, Your Honor, if the Court would like a little bit more assurance as far as a third-party custodian is concerned, Your Honor, we would also submit to the Court that my client's uncle, Mr. Doran Jones, who is also here raising his right hand, has voiced his willingness to serve as a third-party custodian.

So basic information about Mr. Jones, Your Honor: He is 57 (sic) years of age, he currently works at the

back row, Your Honor. So they're here really to show their support of Mr. Williams, really to show the Court that they believe he would abide by any conditions of release that this

24

25

Court could set.

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
So that being the proffer, Your Honor, obviously I
 2
 3
     do have argument at the proper time.
 4
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Kimball.
 5
              All right, Mr. DePadilla.
 6
              MR. DEPADILLA: Yes, Your Honor. Turning to the
 7
     strength of the evidence in this case, the defendant put on
 8
     Facebook that he stands with ISIS. Which one of the terms
 9
     the State Department deemed is called Dalwah, D-A-L-W-A-H,
10
     so, "I stand with Dalwah" or ISIS. The defendant gave a
11
    Mirandized confession to the FBI that he stands with ISIS and
12
     that he hopes they are successful. He also stated publicly
1.3
     that -- he posted, "I can't wait for the day that the black
```

flag of Islam exists all over Maryland, the District of

Columbia, Virginia, and Chicago."

The defendant met with an undercover who presented himself as a financier for ISIS. The financier asked him for a donation to the cause. The financier was very careful to qualify that donation. He said, "Your money is going to go for the lions of Mosul," which in the terminology of ISIS are the people that are fighting overseas for ISIS. So the undercover clarified, "If you give money, it is going to be for this."

The defendant was given time to think about it. He was provided with an electronic means, whether or not he

wanted to make the donation. At that point he reconnected with them, made the donation. The FBI followed up with him again and sent him a digital picture of a rocket launcher and other military materials and said, "This is where your money went." He texted back, "Praise God. God is great." And then he put a smily face after it, one of those emoticons. And he said, "I'm going to delete this, and I'll hit you back in a minute."

The defendant was asked in his Mirandized interview, "Did you meet with someone?" The defendant denied he met with anyone, and then when he was confronted with evidence

The defendant donated to the cause a second time. He was told, through the undercover, that the undercover was overseas in the fight and they needed money for ammunition, and the defendant sent them a wire transmission to cover ammunition.

from the meet he said he couldn't comment on that.

Your Honor, I would offer in Exhibit 1. I've shown it to the defense. This is surveillance footage on the Wal-Mart where he makes the monetary donation.

Finally, Your Honor, the defendant was contacted one final time as this case was coming to its conclusion, and that will make more sense when I explain the characteristics of the defendant. But he was asked one final time, "Will you give more money to the cause?" He stated something to the

effect of, "Yes. I want to empty money out of my pockets before I go, before I go, God willing." And he said his plan was to die without any money in his pockets. That's coming, Your Honor, in December 2016, so just a few weeks ago, when the arrest was effectuated.

So now turning to these characteristics, he has no job. While he does have a residence with his grandmother, and the uncle does live there as well, I'll address that at the end.

He has a heavy electronic presence, communicating about ISIS with people all over. This is what he does. He regularly has videos along those lines of ISIS and the beheadings and the things like that. Mr. Williams told the FBI he thinks the beheadings are the same as the electric chair in America and that the killings are justified; it's really just an eye-for-an-eye, it's war.

His characteristics include that he told the FBI that he doesn't like the concept of hitting soft targets but he understands the tactic. And, so, then he was asked to define, what is a soft target, and he said that was the civilian population. So then he said that hard targets are soldiers, law enforcement, or U.S. Government installations, and he really has no problem with those.

The defendant was asked straight out did he give money to support terrorism. He said, "No," and then when he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was confronted with the financial transaction records he said he couldn't comment on that.

At various times he discussed with the undercover martyrdom operations. He was not concerned with doing such an operation, but he wanted to make sure that his intentions were pure enough if he was going to go forward with this. And Mr. Williams' logic -- and he took the time to explain this to the FBI -- was if you kill yourself in one of these type operations and your intentions are not pure, then it's just suicide. But if your intentions are pure, then you are doing it for the cause. And what happened in December of this year, beginning in the end of November, is Mr. Williams told the undercover he had a plan to increase his purity; that he was going to marry, via the Internet, a Muslim woman in Brazil, and that if this marriage went through he would be pure enough to go forth and carry on with his plan. And he said, "If the marriage goes through I shall go forth, with or without. I shall get my tools, and the next time I will see my bride is in Jana," which is Heaven. So that's what he's saying to the undercover, he would not see his bride again until the after life, which precipitated the probable cause arrest that went forward soon after that.

Finally, Your Honor, when he was arrested in his house was an AK47 that had one bullet in the chamber, 16 rounds in the mag, a nine-millimeter gun with one round in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
the chamber and, I think it was, seven or eight rounds in the
magazine. And he made a comment along the lines of, "You are
lucky you arrested me outside my house." So the FBI asked,
"Well, what would have happened if we came into your house?"
And he said, "Well, if you came into my house I would
have," in effect, "had a gun battle with you." And so he was
asked, well, what was going to happen to your grandmother --
who, again, Mr. Kimball has pointed out she's here today --
and Mr. Williams said, "She knows when to die."
         Your Honor, as part of the FBI's due diligence they
interviewed the uncle and the grandmother, and we don't
believe they knew anything about what was going on here.
What the uncle said was the week before Mr. Williams was
walking around at night carrying his gun in his hand and
acting very erratically, and he said that he almost called
the police based on this erratic behavior. What the
grandmother said was recently he's become extremely
disconnected from his friends and that he is always on his
computer and his phone.
         So that would be the strength of the evidence and
the characteristics, and then I just have argument, Your
Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. DePadilla.
        All right, Mr. Kimball, I'll hear any rebuttal to
that, and I'll hear your argument as well.
```

MR. KIMBALL: Your Honor, I would again rely on what is set forth in the Pretrial Services report and just basically argue, Your Honor, ultimately with the recommendation that has been put forth by the Probation Office of this Court, and that is that my client should be released on bond while this case is pending.

I've had some preliminary discussions with counsel for the government, and my understanding, Your Honor, is this is going to be a CIPA case, so it's not as though we're looking at the typical or general pretrial detention of about 70 days. I suspect that the trial, Your Honor, will be -- I don't know exactly, but certainly it will be a lot longer out, farther out, than 70 days from today or next week. So I think that's something that the Court can also keep in the back of its mind when weighing the various factors that the Court has to in deciding whether or not Mr. Williams should be granted bond.

He has very strong family support, Your Honor. His uncle, his grandmother, his cousin is here from Northern Virginia, he has a number of family friends that have known him for a very long time, and he also has support from the local Muslim community.

A sentence, Your Honor, if convicted, in this particular case is not the sort of sentence that I would suggest to the Court necessarily provides an incentive to

flee. We do not have a mandatory minimum in this case; the statutory maximum is 20 years, if convicted. And there have been a number of cases across this country where individuals convicted of the very charge that Mr. Williams is facing — and that is attempt to provide material support to a designated foreign terrorist organization — the range of sentences on these cases, Your Honor, is pretty wide. There have been cases where the defendants have received as low as probation, and certainly will have been sentences that have been closer to the statutory max, but there's also been a number of cases that sort of hover around that ten-year mark, if you will.

So I would suggest to the Court that the sentence, if convicted, is not something that would automatically cause this young man to flee. Especially, Your Honor, I would point out that the alleged material support that he provided was allegedly a total of \$250. Now, in the grand scheme of things, I don't know, really, how much support that would actually be providing. And certainly, while that may be important — obviously, it's an element of the charged crime, but as far as if convicted of that charge, I think the degree, or the amount, or the extent of the material support is certainly something that the sentencing judge will take into consideration, if he's, in fact, found guilty and faces sentencing for this offense.

He's a man, Your Honor, of 26 years of age. He has resided in this area -- specifically, the rural part of Suffolk -- for all of his life. He has lived with his grandmother for his whole life. His mother is deceased. His father is up in the D.C. area, but there's no real relationship there, Your Honor. He graduated from high school. He has attained a degree from a culinary arts school. And while he was not employed at the time of his arrest just a few weeks ago, he was most recently employed, as the Pretrial Services report notes, as a chef or cook at a country club in Suffolk, and he had that job until October of this year. So he has demonstrated, Your Honor, that he can hold a job.

In addition, Your Honor, he has, really, no criminal record to speak of. He certainly has no criminal convictions. He has a traffic conviction for improper driving. So it's not as though he has any sort of history, Your Honor, that the Court would automatically assume that he would not be able to abide by any conditions that this Court could set.

Now, Mr. DePadilla, you know, proffered a good bit of the evidence, alleged evidence, that they have, and certainly there was a criminal complaint with an affidavit that was rather detailed that perhaps the Court has seen, but what you don't have is any alleged connections to actual

```
members of ISIS, Your Honor, or any connections in the Middle East at all.
```

I would disagree with Mr. DePadilla. I don't think the weight of the evidence is that strong, Your Honor. Basically, what we have here is a young man who was engaging in not just legal activity, Your Honor, or lawful activity but actually constitutionally protected activity. And he was engaged in those constitutionally protected actions up until the time that the FBI got involved. He's an actively practicing Muslim, and we know that that's protected by the First Amendment.

He had an AK47, but guess what? He's not a convicted felon, and he purchased it lawfully. He wasn't trying to hide that. So then we have the Second Amendment.

And then apparently he was allegedly making a lot of posts on Facebook and engaging in a lot of political speech, religious rhetoric, but, again, that goes right back to the First Amendment. And even if that speech is unpopular, perhaps disturbing to some, it is still constitutionally protected speech.

I would submit to the Court, Your Honor, that there is a strong likelihood here that Mr. Williams was entrapped, and the Court knows that at this stage he is presumed innocent.

We have, obviously, the Pretrial Services report, we

have what has been proffered to the Court today, and the Court is guided by the Bail Reform Act. And I'm not suggesting to the Court that you would not abide by that, but the Bail Reform Act sets the bar rather high, and that's because our system values freedom. And before that freedom can be taken away, even at a pretrial stage, the Court knows the government has to present a compelling case that there are no conditions that could ensure that Mr. Williams would come back to court or that he's not a threat to anybody.

He is presumed innocent, Your Honor. And I know that the charge here is serious. It certainly sounds scary -- excuse me, Your Honor -- sounds scary. And, naturally, perhaps in this time more than ever there may be an implicit bias and fear that might naturally exist around this sort of a case, but that's another reason why the Court has to follow the Bail Reform Act, and when the Court does that, those standards clearly call for Mr. Williams' release.

There's a lot of noise here, but when you get right down to it all we really have is an alleged contribution of \$250, and I would suggest to the Court that entrapment is flowing throughout this case once the FBI got involved.

There's no indication, there's no information known to us that's been presented to the Court that Mr. Williams was doing anything before the FBI got involved other than enjoying those constitutional protections that every citizen

in this country has.

The Probation Office, Judge, I would submit, courageously has recommended release, and we would second that and ask the Court to release our client with, perhaps, the conditions that Mr. Armitage has suggested, but the Court can certainly impose more if the Court has some pause. And that's why I suggested my client's uncle as a potential third-party custodian.

And I know that the FBI interviewed my client's uncle and my client's grandmother, and perhaps there was some alleged erratic behavior on my client's part, but, you know, was that created by the FBI? I mean, I don't know, Your Honor. It's something to think about. But I think the key point is here before they got involved was he any sort of damage or a threat to anybody, and I would submit that he was not, Your Honor, and I would submit that he should be released.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kimball, what should the Court make of the proffer that the government made that your client was engaged in discussions discussing potential martyrdom? That's a disturbing allegation, isn't it?

MR. KIMBALL: Well, it could be disturbing, Judge, but just talking about something, that doesn't necessarily -- I mean, there's no information presented that there was an actual plan in place. Even in the affidavit in support of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
the criminal complaint, that part of the pie was certainly
missing. There was talk of it, but there was no real plan.
So I would submit to the Court that it was simple talk on his
part, bravado, if you will. I wouldn't think it would be
serious, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Kimball.
         Mr. DePadilla, let's hear your argument.
         MR. DEPADILLA: Thank you, Your Honor.
         Your Honor, we're not asking you to detain him
because of speech, we're asking you to detain him because we
think he's an active danger to this community. We're also
asking you to detain him because I think for another reason
he is a risk of flight. He has declared that he is with this
organization, ISIS. I think if tomorrow he could get over
there and fight with them he would go and do it, right? Now,
I'm not saying that that's possible, but it certainly gives
him impetus to leave this community and continue to aid them
in any way.
         But primarily we're relying on danger. He has said
publicly that he's loyal to these people, that he wants this
black flag of Islam to fly over the major cities in this
area.
         He made his intentions clear. He was told up front,
this money is going for fighting, and that's what it's for.
```

They sent him a picture of a rocket launcher, and he said,

"Praise be to God" and sent a smily face. That's not entrapment, that's just telling you where your money is going.

More importantly, Your Honor, I think you hit upon it exactly. The things that spun this case up in November and December was his own independent plan for martyrdom. There are no allegations the FBI sent him down this path, because they didn't do that. This idea was on his own; that he wanted to reach this point, according to him, where he could be more pure. He was in contact with a Muslim woman in Brazil, and he reported back to the undercover that when he became pure enough through this marriage he was going to go forth, get his tools, and the next time he would see his bride would be in Jana, or in Heaven.

And, I'm sorry, I left this out, but of course the undercover asked him at that point is it going to be local, and he said, "The only way." So now you have the FBI not only looking at this generalized threat of terrorism, it's now been particularized to Suffolk and Hampton Roads by this defendant.

Mr. Kimball is absolutely right, he was legally allowed to buy that AK47. He bought it the day after the San Bernardino shootings. Coincidence? Possibly, but when someone is radicalizing over the Internet and a major terrorism event happens in this country and his next decision

```
is to buy an AK47, it is going to escalate the situation that much further. Because what this man has said, not only in his postings but Mirandized to the FBI, is that he believes in fighting against hard targets, police, government institutions, things like that, and the way you perpetuate an attack against them is with an AK47. That's the fastest way to go about wreaking havoc, and that's what happened out in San Bernardino.
```

But you've got even more disturbing -- not from a terrorist standpoint, but just how the Court would evaluate any case, right? Because the Court regularly evaluates cases where police or federal agents are making arrests. This man said, "You're lucky you didn't come into my house. I would have started shooting at you guys." Not many people say that. Not many people -- Mr. Kimball used the word "courageous" -- will admit that, "If you guys came into my house as the FBI I was going to gun you down." But also that kind of shows his callousness because, you know, the FBI asked, "What was going to happen to your grandma," and he said, "Oh, she knows when to die." Your Honor, the FBI tells me she's approximately 80 years old.

A gun fight with AK47s and FBI agents can do untold havoc to the people out in that location, and that's why the FBI did the safe thing and arrested him on the side of the road.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
We believe the defense has not overcome the
presumption, and we also believe the Court can find there is
no conditions that will ensure that he will not be a danger
to this community and, to a lesser extent, would not flee and
go join ISIS at the drop of a hat.
         Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. DePadilla.
         Mr. Kimball, do you wish to make any rebuttal to the
government's argument.
         MR. KIMBALL: Your Honor, just with regard to the
AK47.
         I mean, the evidence is that he purchased that in
December of last year. And, again, he did nothing unlawful
with that AK47. Even well before the FBI got involved, which
I believe was in March or April of 2016, and then even after
they became involved with Mr. Williams, there's no
information that Mr. Williams did anything or even put a plan
together to even use that gun or any other gun, Your Honor.
And there are no firearms in the home, there are no computers
in the home. A cell phone, of course, has been seized. He
has no Internet access, and that would certainly be a
condition if the Court would was concerned and Mr. DePadilla
was concerned about a continued Internet or Facebook presence
or what have you. So...
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Kimball.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Well, as the parties are aware and as Mr. Kimball has specifically pointed out, this Court is bound by the parameters of the Bail Reform Act. And under those parameters the Court looks first at the seriousness of the charges, and obviously a charge of attempting to provide material support to a designated foreign terrorist organization, which carries with it a maximum sentence of 20 years in prison, is a very serious charge. The weight of the evidence -- this is a common theme. The government doesn't necessarily show all of its cards. The weight of the evidence here is significant; it's not necessarily overwhelming. Regardless of whether the amount of material support is \$250 or \$250,000, that may go to the seriousness of the offense, but it doesn't go to the weight of the The statute just requires that there be some material support, and in this case the government has proffered that they have significant evidence in that regard. With respect to the third factor, which is the history and characteristics of the defendant, Mr. Williams obviously has the support of family. He's lived his life with his grandmother, he's a lifelong residence, he's got an

uncle that lives in close proximity, he has family members who have appeared in his support in court, and he has friends as well who appeared in support of him. So he appears to have a strong family and friends network.

While he's not employed now, he has had employment in the past, and he has had both a high school and an Associate of Arts education. He doesn't appear to have the assets to flee, and he has not really any criminal record to speak of. So those are elements which go in Mr. Williams' favor.

The fourth factor that the Court looks at is the risk of danger to the community posed by the defendant's release. It's an interesting argument as to the type of speech that is protected by the First Amendment and whether or not the Court should consider that in evaluating whether that speech could translate into action that poses a danger to the community. But the government's proffer is that this is more than speech that the Court has to consider. It's more than postings on the Internet that say, "I support ISIS," or, "I wish there was a black flag flying over the Commonwealth of Virginia." There appears to have been exchanges with an undercover FBI agent on the subject of martyrdom, on the subject of killing himself in order to attack hard targets; police and government facilities.

Certainly, someone could conduct such activity even without an AK47, as we've seen in Berlin and as we've seen in Nice. Someone who is determined to risk martyrdom in order to inflict harm on this country poses a risk to the community; that the Court does not find there are any

```
1
     conditions that could obviate that risk. While it's just
 2
     allegations at this point, while the defendant certainly has
 3
     not been found guilty of any activity, certainly the proffer
 4
     of the government raises the substantial concern that there
 5
     is potential harm to the community that would be posed by the
     defendant's release.
 6
 7
              And, based on those factors, I am going to order Mr.
 8
     Williams' detention, and I will issue an order to that effect
     as well.
 9
10
              All right. Mr. DePadilla or Mr. Kimball, is there
11
     anything further for the Court to consider in this case?
12
              MR. DEPADILLA: Yes. This matter should be put
1.3
     over to next Wednesday for normal arraignment. That's
14
     January 11th.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Does that work for you,
16
    Mr. Kimball?
17
              MR. KIMBALL: It does, Your Honor. That's fine.
18
              THE COURT: All right. The arraignment of the
19
     defendant will take place on January 11th at 9:00 here in
20
     Norfolk.
2.1
              MR. KIMBALL: Thank you, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: All right. If there's nothing further,
23
     the court will stand in recess.
24
              (The hearing adjourned at 3:12 p.m.)
25
```

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing is a correct
4	transcript, to the best of my ability, of the court's audio
5	recording of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
6	
7	/s
8	Heidi L. Jeffreys
9	
10	January 31, 2017
11	Date
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	